On Dedekind sums with equal values

Kurt Girstmair
Institut für Mathematik, Universität Innsbruck
Technikerstr. 13/7, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria
Kurt.Girstmair@uibk.ac.at

arXiv:1404.4428v1 [math.NT] 17 Apr 2014

Abstract

Dedekind sums $s(m,n)$ occur in many fields of mathematics. Since $s(m_1,n) = s(m_2,n)$ if $m_1 \equiv m_2 \bmod n$, it is natural to ask which of the Dedekind sums $s(m,n)$, $0 \le m < n$, take equal values. So far no simple criterion is known by which the equality of $s(m_1,n)$ and $s(m_2,n)$ could be decided. In this note we show how to obtain non-obvious examples of equal Dedekind sums. We consider two cases which mark the extreme possibilities for the argument n, namely, n a prime power and n square-free. Whereas we can give a partial overview of equal Dedekind sums in the prime power case, such an overview seems to be much more difficult to obtain in the square-free case.

Introduction

Let n be a positive integer and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(m,n) = 1$. The classical *Dedekind sum* $s(m,n)$ is defined by

$$s(m,n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} ((k/n))((mk/n)) \tag{1}$$

where $((\ldots))$ is the "sawtooth function" defined by

$$((t)) = \begin{cases} t - \lfloor t \rfloor - 1/2 & \text{if } t \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \mathbb{Z}; \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in \mathbb{Z} \end{cases}$$

(see, for instance, [15, p. 1]).

Dedekind sums have quite a number of interesting applications in analytic number theory (modular forms), algebraic number theory (class numbers), lattice point problems, topology and algebraic geometry (see, for instance, [1, 2, 4, 13, 15, 16]). Moreover, various properties of these sums have been studied by several authors (see, for instance, [3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 17, 18]).

In the present setting it is more convenient to work with

$$S(m,n) = 12s(m,n)$$

instead. Observe that $S(m_1,n) = S(m_2,n)$ if $m_1 \equiv m_2 \bmod n$, so one often considers only arguments m in the range $0 \le m < n$.

If we fix n, we may ask which of the Dedekind sums $S(m,n)$, $0 \le m < n$, $(m,n)=1$, take equal values. In the paper [11] it was shown that $S(m_1,n) = S(m_2,n)$ only if

$$(m_1 - m_2)(m_1 m_2 - 1) \equiv 0 \bmod n. \tag{2}$$

This condition, however, is not sufficient for the equality of $S(m_1,n)$ and $S(m_2,n)$. Indeed, the condition is necessary and sufficient for

$$S(m_1,n) - S(m_2,n) \in \mathbb{Z}$$

(see [7]). It seems that a simple necessary and sufficient condition for the equality of $S(m_1,n)$ and $S(m_2,n)$ is currently out of reach.

Suppose, for the moment, that $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_r$ is square-free (so $p_1, \dots, p_r$ are distinct primes) and that m_1 is given. It is known that the number of integers m_2, $0 \le m_2 < n$, $(m_2,n)=1$, such that $S(m_1,n) - S(m_2,n) \in \mathbb{Z}$ is $\le 2^r$ (see [7, Th. 3]). In particular, there are at most 2^r numbers m_2 in this range with $S(m_1,n) = S(m_2,n)$. Accordingly, the Dedekind sums $S(m,n)$, $0 \le m < n$, $(m,n)=1$, take at least

$$\prod_{j=1}^{r} \frac{p_j - 1}{2}$$

distinct values. So there are, as a rule, plenty of values $S(m,n)$ that must be distinguished.

In view of this situation, it may be worthwhile exhibiting *series* of equal Dedekind sums. To this end we apply two theorems from the literature (one of Rademacher and one of our own). Whereas the first theorem gives insight into the case of powers $n = l^k$, $k \ge 2$ (so it comprises, in particular, the case of prime powers), the second one supplies examples of equal Dedekind sums for square-free numbers n. In the prime power case $n = p^k$ we obtain a partial overview of the equalities $S(m_1,n) = S(m_2,n)$ that can occur in this situation. In the square-free case such an overview seems to be much more difficult to obtain.

In all of these examples we distinguish between *obvious* equality and *non-obvious* equality. Indeed, it is almost obvious from (1) that $S(m,n) = S(m^*,n)$, where m^* is a *multiplicative inverse* of m mod n, i.e., $mm^* \equiv 1 \bmod n$ (see [15, p. 26]). This case of equality is addressed as the obvious case, whereas all other cases are considered as non-obvious.

1. The power case

In the paper [14], Rademacher enunciated his Satz 15 in a way which does not immediately show its applicability to equal Dedekind sums. Here we note a slightly weaker version of Rademacher's result, which, however, obviously produces examples of equal Dedekind sums, namely,

Theorem 1 *Let d and n be positive integers and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(m,n)=1$. Let $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Then*

$$S(\varepsilon + dnm, dn^2) = \varepsilon \left(\frac{2}{dn^2} + d - 3 \right). \tag{3}$$

Rademacher proved his theorem by means of invariants of binary quadratic forms. In Section 3 we shall give a proof of Theorem 1 by means of the three-term relation for Dedekind sums (which is due to Rademacher and Dieter). Therefore, this proof is, in some sense, more at home in the setting of Dedekind sums than Rademacher's proof. Moreover, our proof may serve as a model for the proof of Theorem 2, which is the basis of Section 2.

In the setting of Theorem 1, let m run through all integers $0 \le m < n$, $(m,n) = 1$. The theorem says that each of the Dedekind sums $S(\varepsilon + dnm, dn^2)$ takes the same value. So whenever $\varphi(n) > 2$, there must be non-obvious cases of equal values among them.

Example. Let $d = 8$, $n = 5$. Then $S(1 + 40m, 200) = 1/100 + 5 = 5.01$ for $m = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Here the equality $S(41, 200) = S(81, 200)$ is non-obvious in the above sense, whereas $S(41, 100) = S(161, 100)$ is obvious.

In the case of powers $n = l^k$, Rademacher's theorem and Theorem 1 give the same, namely,

Corollary 1 *Let l, k, r, q be positive integers and $r \le k$. Suppose that $q \mid l^{k-r}$ and $l \nmid q$. Suppose, further, that one of the following holds:*

(a) $r \ge k/2$;

(b) $r < k/2$ and $l^{k-2r} \mid q^2$.

Let $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. If m is an integer such that $(m, l^{k-r}/q) = 1$, then

$$S(\varepsilon + l^r qm, l^k) = \varepsilon \left(\frac{2}{l^k} + l^{2r-k} q^2 - 3 \right). \tag{4}$$

Proof of Corollary 1. In the setting of this corollary, put $n = l^{k-r}/q$ (a positive integer) and $d = l^{2r-k} q^2$. In the case of assumption (a), $2r - k \ge 0$, so d is a positive integer. This is also true in the case of assumption (b). Then $dn = l^r q$ and $dn^2 = l^k$. Accordingly, Theorem 1 gives (4) for each integer m with $(m, l^{k-r}/q) = 1$. □

Examples. 1. Let $l = 6$, $k = 4$, $r = 2$ and $q = 4$ (so assumption (a) holds). Then $l^{k-r}/q = 36/4 = 9$ and $l^r q = 144$. For $m = 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8$ we have $S(1 + 144m, 1296) = 2/1296 + 16 - 3 = 2/1296 + 13$. Again, the equality of the values is non-obvious for $m = 1, 2, 4$.

2. The case (b) is illustrated by the following example. Let $l = 12$, $k = 3$, $r = 1$ and $q = 6$. Here $12\,(= l^{k-2r})$ divides $36\,(= q^2)$. We obtain $S(1 + 72m, 1728) = 2/1728 + 36/12 - 3 = 2/1728$ for m relatively prime to $l^{k-r}/q = 24$. The equality of the values is non-obvious for $m = 1, 5, 7, 11$.

If $l = p$ is a prime number, only the case $q = 1$ is possible since $p \nmid q$ and $q \mid p^{k-r}$. Accordingly, only case (a) of Corollary 1 applies here. In this case, however, we have much more information about the equality of Dedekind sums. Indeed, suppose that $(m_1, p) = 1$ and $m_1 \not\equiv \pm 1 \bmod p$. If m_2 satisfies (2), we either have $m_1 \equiv m_2 \bmod p$ or $m_1 m_2 \equiv 1 \bmod p$. Each of these cases excludes the other because $m_1^2 \equiv 1 \bmod p$ implies $m_1 \equiv \pm 1 \bmod p$. So we are left with $m_1 \equiv m_2 \bmod p^k$ or $m_1 m_2 \equiv 1 \bmod p^k$. In other words, the assumption $m_1 \not\equiv \pm 1 \bmod p$ allows only obvious equalities $S(m_1, p^k) = S(m_2, p^k)$.

Hence we have to consider only numbers m_1 of the form $m_1 = \varepsilon + p^r m$, $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$, $p \nmid m$, $1 \le r \le k$. Here we obtain a complete overview of equal values of Dedekind sums if we assume $r \ge k/2$. Let this assumption hold. In [8, equ. (9)] we have shown that

$S(m_1, p^k) - S(m_2, p^k) \in \mathbb{Z}$ only if $m_2 = \varepsilon + p^{r'} m'$, $r' \geq k/2$, $p \nmid m'$. By Corollary 1, we have

$$S(m_1, p^k) = \varepsilon(2/p^k + p^{2r-k} - 3) \text{ and } S(m_2, p^k) = \varepsilon(2/p^k + p^{2r'-k} - 3).$$

So these values are equal if, and only if, $r = r'$. Altogether, we obtain

Corollary 2 *Let p be a prime number and k, r positive integers with $k/2 \leq r \leq k$. Let $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ and $m_1 = \varepsilon + p^r m$ with an integer m, $p \nmid m$. For $m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \nmid m_2$, we have $S(m_2, p^k) = S(m_1, p^k)$ if, and only if, $m_2 = \varepsilon + p^r m'$, $m' \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \nmid m'$. In this case*

$$S(m_1, p^k) = S(m_2, p^k) = \varepsilon \left(\frac{2}{p^k} + p^{2r-k} - 3 \right).$$

Remark. In the case $1 \leq r < k/2$ there is apparently no result like Corollary 2. Consider, for instance, $p = 3$, $k = 5$, $r = 2$. There are 18 values $1 + 9m$, $3 \nmid m$, in the range $0 \leq 1 + 9m < 243$. It suffices to consider $m = 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17$, since the remaining values $1 + 9m$ arise from these as multiplicative inverses mod 243. The corresponding Dedekind sums have the form

$$S(1 + 9m, 243) = \frac{83}{243} + z,$$

with $z \in \{-27, -19, -11, -3, 5, 13, 21\}$ (so all of these Dedekind sums have the same fractional part). The only equal values among these occur for $m = 4$ and $m' = 14$ (with $z = 5$), and for $m = 11$ and $m' = 16$ (with $z = -11$).

If we apply the above considerations (in particular, Corollary 2) to the case $k = 2$, $r = 1$, we obtain

Corollary 3 *Let p be a prime number and $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Then all values $S(\varepsilon + pm, p^2)$, $m = 1, \ldots, p-1$, are equal, namely,*

$$S(\varepsilon + pm, p^2) = \varepsilon \left(\frac{2}{p^2} - 2 \right).$$

If $p \geq 5$, we have, thus, non-obvious equalities $S(m_1, p^2) = S(m_2, p^2)$ for $m_1, m_2 \in \{1 + pm; m = 1, \ldots, (p-1)/2\}$, $m_1 \neq m_2$. All other non-obvious equalities $S(m_1, p^2) = S(m_2, p^2)$, $m_1, m_2 \in \{1, \ldots, p^2 - 1\}$, $p \nmid m_1, m_2$, arise from these by transition to multiplicative inverses mod p^2.

2. The square-free case

Many examples of non-obvious equalities in the square-free case arise from

Theorem 2 *Let n be a positive integer and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(m, n) = 1$. As above, let $m^* \in \mathbb{Z}$ denote an inverse of m mod n, i.e., $mm^* \equiv 1 \bmod n$. Let t be a positive integer with $t \equiv m - m^* \bmod n$. Then*

$$S(1 + mt, nt) = \frac{2}{nt} + \frac{t}{n} - 3. \tag{5}$$

For a proof of Theorem 2, see [9]. In Section 3 we briefly show how to adapt the proof of Theorem 1 in order to obtain a proof of Theorem 2. In what follows, $\left(\frac{q}{p}\right)$ denotes the Legendre symbol for an integer q and a prime p.

Corollary 4 *Let t be a positive integer and $t^2+4 = qk^2$, where q is square-free and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_r$ be prime numbers ≥ 3 such that $p_j \nmid k$ and $\left(\frac{q}{p_j}\right) = 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, r$. Put $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r$. Then there are 2^r distinct numbers m, $0 \leq m < n$, $(m,n) = 1$, such that* (5) holds.

Proof. Let t be as in the corollary and $j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. The congruence

$$m^2 - tm - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod p_j$$

has two distinct solutions m_1, m_2 in $\{1, \ldots, p_j - 1\}$, given by

$$m_1, m_2 \equiv (t \pm \sqrt{q}k)2^* \bmod p_j,$$

where $\sqrt{q}$ denotes an integer l with $l^2 \equiv q \bmod p_j$ and 2^* a multiplicative inverse of 2 mod p_j. Now the Chinese remainder theorem shows that the congruence

$$m^2 - tm - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod n \tag{6}$$

has 2^r distinct solutions $m \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ with $(m,n) = 1$. If m^* is a multiplicative inverse of m mod n, (6) can be written $m - t - m^* \equiv 0 \bmod n$, i.e., $t \equiv m - m^* \bmod n$. Accordingly, Theorem 2 applies to each solution m of (6) and gives (5). □

Remarks. 1. If $m_1 \not\equiv m_2 \bmod n$, then $1 + m_1 t \not\equiv 1 + m_2 t \bmod nt$. So the corollary supplies 2^r numbers $1 + mt$ which are distinct mod nt such that the corresponding Dedekind sums $S(1 + mt, nt)$ all have the same value. In particular, there is a set M of 2^{r-1} numbers $1 + mt$ of this kind such that all numbers in M are distinct mod nt and no number in M has its multiplicative inverse mod nt in M.

2. In order to obtain examples of non-obvious equality for square-free numbers nt, one has to choose t square-free and the primes p_j such that $p_j \nmid t$, $j = 1, \ldots, r$. Suppose that, in this situation, t is fixed, whereas r becomes large. Then the number 2^r of distinct numbers m such that (5) holds has the same order of magnitude as the largest possible number of arguments m' for which $S(m', nt)$ can take the same value (which is $2^{r+r'}$, where r' is the number of prime factors of t, as we pointed out in the Introduction).

Example. We choose $t = 7$, so $t^2 + 4 = 53$, i.e., $q = 53$ and $k = 1$. Further $p_1 = 11$, $p_2 = 13$, $p_3 = 17$ and $p_4 = 29$ do not divide t and satisfy $\left(\frac{53}{p_j}\right) = 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, 4$. Hence we have $n = 70499$ and $nt = 493493$. Here $m = 706$ is one of 16 solutions of the congruence (6). Therefore, we obtain 16 numbers $1 + mt \in \{1, \ldots, nt\}$, $(m,n) = 1$, such that $S(1 + mt, nt) = 2/(nt) + t/n - 3 \approx -2.9998966551$. The first five of these numbers $1 + mt$ are 4943, 58535, 79556, 94669, 148261, their inverses mod nt being 488601, 435009, 413988, 398875, 345283, respectively.

Remark. Once n and t have been chosen, it is possible to vary t. Indeed, put $t_1 = t + ln$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l \geq 1$. Then $t_1 \equiv m - m^* \bmod n$, so Theorem 2 also holds for t_1 instead of t. In our example, we choose $t_1 = t + 2n = 7 + 2 \cdot 70499 = 141005$, which is

the product of the primes 5 and 28201. Thereby, we obtain 16 numbers $1 + mt_1$ such that $S(1 + mt_1, nt_1) = 2/(nt_1) + t_1/n - 3 \approx -0.9999007076$.

In Corollary 4, the crucial condition for the choice of the primes p_j was

$$\left(\frac{q}{p}\right) = 1. \tag{7}$$

Whenever a prime $p \geq 3$, $p \nmid k$, satisfies this condition, it is eligible as one of the primes p_j, $j = 1, \ldots, r$. It is not difficult to see that the set of primes $p \geq 3$ satisfying (7) has the analytic density $1/2$ (where the set of all primes has density 1). Hence there are plenty of primes that can be chosen. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to collect some of these primes (for small square-free numbers t) in a table (see Table 1). Since nt should be square-free, we have omitted primes p which divide t.

t	q	k	p
1	5	1	11, 19, 29, 31, 41, 59
2	2	2	7, 17, 23, 31, 41, 47
3	13	1	17, 23, 29, 43, 53, 61
5	29	1	7, 13, 23, 53, 59, 67
6	10	2	13, 31, 37, 41, 43, 53
7	53	1	11, 13, 17, 29, 37, 43
10	26	2	11, 17, 19, 23, 37, 59

Table 1.

Remarks. 1. Further examples of equal Dedekind sums in the square-free case can be obtained from two theorems of Rademacher (see [14]). Whereas one of the nontrivial cases of his Satz 13 coincides with our case $t = 1$, the other nontrivial case concerns solutions of the congruence

$$m^2 - m + 1 \equiv 0 \bmod n.$$

Hence it involves square-roots of -3 mod n. His Satz 14, on the other hand, involves square-roots of 3 mod n. Therefore, this case is also not covered by Corollary 4; indeed, it is not difficult to see that our parameter q cannot be equal to 3.

2. For square-free positive integers n with at least three prime factors, non-obvious equality seems to be a fairly common phenomenon. For instance, let $n = 7 \cdot 11 \cdot 13 \cdot 17 = 17017$ and m_1 run through $2, 3, 4, 5, 6$. In all of these cases there are 16 values m_2 such that (2) holds, except $m_1 = 6$, where we have only 8 values m_2 of this kind. Moreover, non-obvious equality occurs for all of these numbers m_1. For $m_1 = 4$, say, there are 8 numbers m_2 for which $S(m_2, n)$ takes the same value; for $m_1 = 5$ there are 10 such numbers. But with the exception of Corollary 4 and Rademacher's results we do not know anything for certain.

3. Proof of Theorem 1

Let n and d be positive integers and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(m, n) = 1$. Further, let $c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(c, d) = 1$. Suppose that $q = md - nc$ is positive. The three-term relation of Rademacher and Dieter

connects the Dedekind sums $S(m,n)$ and $S(c,d)$ in the following way:

$$S(m,n) = S(c,d) + S(r,q) + \frac{n}{dq} + \frac{d}{nq} + \frac{q}{nd} - 3 \tag{8}$$

(see, for instance, [6, Lemma 1]). Here r is defined as follows: Let j,k be integers such that

$$-cj + dk = 1. \tag{9}$$

Then

$$r = -nk + mj. \tag{10}$$

We put $d = n$ and $c = m - ln$ with $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l > 0$. Hence $q = mn - n(m - ln) = ln^2 > 0$. In accordance with (9), we need integers j,k such that

$$-mj + n(lj + k) = 1.$$

Therefore, we may choose $j = -m^*$, where m^* satisfies $mm^* \equiv 1 \bmod n$, and $k = (1 - mm^* + nlm^*)/n = (1 - mm^*)/n + lm^*$. By (10),

$$r = -1 - lnm^*.$$

Since $d = n$ and $c \equiv m \bmod n$, $S(m,n) = S(c,d)$. Accordingly, (8) reads

$$0 = S(-1 - lnm^*, ln^2) + \frac{2}{ln^2} + l - 3. \tag{11}$$

If we observe $S(-1 - lnm^*, ln^2) = -S(1 + lnm^*, ln^2)$, we have

$$S(1 + lnm^*, ln^2) = \frac{2}{ln^2} + l - 3. \tag{12}$$

Further, we observe that the right hand side of (12) does not depend on m, but only on l and n. Hence we may replace m^* by m, which gives

$$S(1 + lnm, ln^2) = \frac{2}{ln^2} + l - 3. \tag{13}$$

Since $-1 + lnm = -(1 + ln(-m))$ and $S(1 + ln(-m), ln^2) = S(1 + lnm, ln^2)$, we obtain

$$S(-1 + lnm, ln^2) = -\left(\frac{2}{ln^2} + l - 3\right). \tag{14}$$

If we write d instead of l, the identities (13) and (14) are just what (3) says. □

Remark. The following modifications in the proof of Theorem 1 yield a proof of Theorem 2: Suppose that the positive integer t is such that $t \equiv m - m^* \bmod n$. Hence $t = m - m^* + ln$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. As in the proof of Theorem 1, we put $d = n$, but $c = m^* - ln$ and $j = -m$. Again $S(m,n) = S(c,d)$, and instead of (11) we have

$$0 = S(-1 - mt, nt) + \frac{2}{nt} + \frac{t}{n} - 3,$$

from which (5) follows.

References

[1] T. M. Apostol, Modular Functions and Dirichlet Series in Number Theory. Springer, New York, 1976.

[2] M. Atiyah, The logarithm of the Dedekind η-function, Math. Ann. 278 (1987), 335–380.

[3] Ph. Barkan, Sur les sommes de Dedekind et les fractions continues finies, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 284 (1977), no. 16, A923–A926.

[4] M. Beck, S., Robins, Computing the continuous discretely. Integer-point enumeration in polyhedra. Springer, New York, 2007.

[5] R. W. Bruggeman, On the distribution of Dedekind sums, in: Contemp. Math. 166, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994, 197–210.

[6] K. Girstmair, Dedekind sums with predictable signs, Acta. Arith. 83 (1998), 283–294.

[7] K. Girstmair, A criterion for the equality of Dedekind sums mod $\mathbb{Z}$, to appear in Internat. J. Number Th.

[8] K. Girstmair, On the fractional parts of Dedekind sums, submitted.

[9] K. Girstmair, Approximation of rational numbers by Dedekind sums, to appear in Internat. J. Number Th.

[10] D. Hickerson, Continued fractions and density results for Dedekind sums, J. reine angew. Math. 290 (1977), 113–116.

[11] S. Jabuka, S. Robins, X. Wang, When are two Dedekind sums equal?, Internat. J. Number Th. 7 (2011), 2197-2202.

[12] D. E. Knuth, Notes on generalized Dedekind sums, Acta Arith. 33 (1977), 297–325.

[13] C. Meyer, Die Berechnung der Klassenzahl Abelscher Körper über Quadratischen Zahlkörpern. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1957.

[14] H. Rademacher, Zur Theorie der Dedekindschen Summen, Math. Z. 63 (1956), 445–463.

[15] H. Rademacher, E. Grosswald, Dedekind sums. Mathematical Association of America, 1972.

[16] G. Urzúa, Arrangements of curves and algebraic surfaces, *J. Algebraic Geom.* 19 (2010), 335–365.

[17] I. Vardi, Dedekind sums have a limiting distribution, Internat. Math. Res. Notices 1993, 1–12.

[18] W. Zhang, A note on the mean square value of the Dedekind sums, Acta Math. Hung. 86 (2000), 275–289.